UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/595,942	10/595,942 05/20/2006 Makoto KUMATORIYA		38195.79	9417	
54067 OKADA	7590 01/26/2010		EXAMINER		
	& BENNETT, LLP	PEETS, MONIQUE R			
1800 Alexander SUITE 200	r Bell Drive	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Reston, VA 201	191	1796			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/26/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JKEATING@KBIPLAW.COM uspto@kbiplaw.com cbennett@kbiplaw.com

Office Action Summary		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/595,94	12	KUMATORIYA ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		MONIQUE	PEETS	1796			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	on appears on the	e cover sheet with the c	correspondence ad	ddress		
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicating period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by eply received by the Office later than three months after the department of the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THE CFR 1.136(a). In no evon. period will apply and w statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tin III expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·		
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	27 October 200	9				
·	•	This action is n					
′=	Since this application is in condition for al	-		secution as to the	e merits is		
<i>/</i> —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>4 and 6</u> is/are pending in the appear of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>4 and 6</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	thdrawn from co					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[] accepted or b)	objected to by the I	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection t	to the drawing(s) b	e held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	18)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) 🔲 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	,	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/595,942 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 4 and 6 are pending.

2. In view of Applicants amendments, Claims 4-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gopalan et al. (6,211,999) are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiyama et al. (6,043,940) in view of Gopalan et al. (6,211,999).

Kamiyama discloses an optical system for optical recording that comprises a hemispheric lens of a single crystal having a refractive index wherein the single-crystal is lithium tantalate [abstract]. Kamiyama further discloses the single-crystal has high crystallinity [col.2'ln25-40]. It is well known in the art that lithium tantalate is made form lithium oxide and tantalum oxide.

Kamiyama fails to disclose the molar composition ration of lithium oxide and tantalum oxide and the birefringence of lithium tantalate.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,942 Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

However, Gopalan et al. discloses a lens material comprising a lithium tantalate single-crystal that requires a low voltage and a photo-functional device comprising the crystal. The crystal has a molar fraction of Li₂O/(Ta₂O₅ +Li₂O) between 0.492 and 0.50. When the molar fraction is converted into molar composition of (Ta₂O₅ +Li₂O), the range of (Ta₂O₅ +Li₂O) is between 0.967 and 1.00 wherein the birefringence of the lithium tantalate falls within the range [abstract]. Gopalan is silent on the properties of birefringence, however the composition taught by Gopalan is the substantially identical the instant claims, therefore the birefringence possesses the substantially identical range. Gopalan discloses a photo-functional comprising a lithium tantalate single-crystal [claim 3]. Gopalan further discloses the lithium tantalate single-crystal enables crystal perfectness and smaller light absorption [col.9;In5-10].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Gopalan with Kaniyama because lithium tantalate single-crystal taught by Gopalan enables crystal perfectness and is useful in lens applications.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues; Gopalan et al. does not teach, suggest, or even recognize that only lithium tanalate having a molar composition ratio of (Li₂O/Ta₂O₅) between 0.975 and 0.982 as recited in Applicant's Claim 4 (among the molar composition ratio of

Art Unit: 1796

 $(\text{Li}_2\text{O}/\text{Ta}_2\text{O}_5)$ between 0.968 and 1.00 disclosed in Gopalan) has a birefringence within - 0.0005 to + 0.0005.

However, the molar composition ratio (0.968 to 1.00) of lithium tanalate taught by Gopalan falls within the range of 0.975 to 0.982 as recited in the instant claim.

Therefore Gopalan teachings read on the limitations of the instant clam.

Applicant argues; Gopalan also fails to teach the relationship between the molar composition ratio and the birefringence of lithium tantalate.

However, the instant claim recites the birefringence of the lithium tantalate is - 0.0005 to + 0.0005, which is (1) a property of lithium tantalate and (2) includes zero (0), when the molar composition ratio is 0.975 to 0.982. Therefore the relationship between the molar composition ratio and the birefringence of lithium tantalate is inherent.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 10/595,942 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONIQUE PEETS whose telephone number is (571)270-7351. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:00am to 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MRP

/Ling-Siu Choi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796